

pected as representing those influences has not the slightest chance of success of election at the polls.

To try to nominate such a candidate is consummate folly in view of the fact that such nomination means ruinous defeat for the entire party at the polls in November.

No sane leader of the democratic party can expect the men of 1896, 1900 and 1908 to abandon their principles, repudiate their platforms and support a candidate who bolted in the first year, was dissatisfied in 1900, and has never been sincerely and fully with the progressive element of the democratic party. Why indorse a candidate who can not hold the votes of the democratic party?

Such a nomination means a repetition of the defeat of 1904 upon a larger scale and with more serious consequences to the democratic party.

Nearly 1,500,000 democrats refused to vote for the democratic candidate in 1904, although Judge Parker was loyal in 1896 and active in support of the candidate and the party in that year.

Do the men who are seeking to foist now upon the national party a representative of these fatal interests desire that 3,000,000 of democrats absent themselves from the polls, or go to them to support other candidates?

The men of 1896, 1900 and 1908 are men of convictions, decided and determined, and a nomination such as that of an attorney-general who for all the years he served found no violator of the criminal section of the Sherman law would mean nothing more nor less than the sweeping of the union by an opposition candidate.

Why ruin the chances to win with our congressional, our state, our county and city candidates on the democratic ticket in order to promote the political ambitions of a man who has not been in thorough accord with the party since 1896?

The party is not deficient in men who can consolidate the party and gain recruits for it.

The party has Wilson, Clark, Foss, Marshall, Kern, Burke of North Dakota, and others who could be named that are incomparably stronger than the ex-attorney-general with the voters.

Why select and push forward, then, for indorsement the one man who can not win, the one candidate who insures defeat?

THE LA FOLLETTE PLATFORM

Below will be found the La Follette platform, announced from Madison:

Madison, Wis., March 13.—United States Senator Robert M. La Follette, in his campaign platform given out here today, declares among other things his belief in the initiative, referendum and recall and direct nominations; government ownership and operation of express companies. He opposes ship subsidy, the Aldrich currency plan and Canadian reciprocity.

Senator La Follette says it is not his purpose at this time to discuss the issues, or, indeed, to do more than suggest his position upon the vitally important ones. He says:

"I believe in:
"The initiative, referendum and recall and direct nominations and elections, not only as applied to states, but also in the extension of these principles to the nation as a whole.

"The equalization of the burdens of taxation, upon a property basis, through the adoption of graduated income and inheritance taxes.

"The parcels post.
"Government ownership of express companies and government operation of express business at actual cost to the public.

"The reasonable valuation of the physical property of railroads, justly inventoried and determined, as the basis for fixing rates, and the extension of the powers and the administrative control of the interstate commerce commission.

"I would have the nation know how much of the \$18,000,000,000 capitalization was contributed by those who own the railroads, and how much by the people themselves.

"I believe in the creation of a commission with power to investigate and ascertain the illegal acts of all trusts and combinations, and with power to ascertain the reasonable valuation—not the monopoly valuation—of the physical properties of the great monopolies, beginning with the natural resources, such as coal, oil and iron; in the creation of a tariff commission of experts clothed with real power to determine the valuation of all the elements of production, costs and profits, the reduction of tariff rates to the ascertained difference between the labor in this country and abroad. Instead of each of these government commissions investigating the

same facts independently, I believe it would be practical for a single board of expert accountants, statisticians, economists and engineers to be empowered to get the facts, not for the confidential use of the president or the departments, but for congress and the public.

"I am opposed to ship subsidies, which, once entrenched, will become another corrupting influence in our politics.

"I am opposed to further extravagance, on the advice of interested persons only, in building battle ships and political navy yards, and favor an unprejudiced commission to investigate and report what is required in the way of national defense.

"I am opposed to the dollar diplomacy which has reduced our state department from its high place as a kindly intermediary of defenseless nations, into a trading outpost for Wall street interests, aiming to exploit those who should be our friends.

"I am opposed to the Aldrich currency scheme which, under the guise of providing elasticity to our currency system and relieving monetary conditions is, in reality, a means of concentration of the currency and the credits of the United States under a fifty-year franchise into those hands which have already secured control of the banking and insurance resources of the country.

"I favor a policy of government ownership and operation of Alaska railroads and coal mines and of an Alaskan steamship line by way of Pacific ports through Panama to New York.

"I was opposed to the Canadian reciprocity agreement when President Taft submitted it to congress January 26, 1911; I was opposed to it when it was before the senate, argued against it, voted against it, and I am against it now."

Accompanying his platform, Senator La Follette makes this statement:

"When Roosevelt became president the total amount of the stock and bond issues of all combinations and trusts, including the railways then in combination, was only \$3,784,000,000. When he turned the country over to Taft, whom he had selected as his successor, the total capitalization of the trusts and combinations amounted to the enormous sum of \$31,672,000,000, more than 70 per cent of which was water. Prices were put upon transportation, and on the products of the mines and factories to pay interests and dividends on this fraudulent capitalization."

While democrats will not indorse all of it—they will approve of most of it, and they will applaud the concluding paragraph on Mr. Roosevelt's anti-trust record. Mr. Roosevelt's attitude on the trust question probably explains his hostility to La Follette—a hostility that has shown itself ever since the two have been prominent in politics. Mr. La Follette is opposed to private monopolies—Mr. Roosevelt is not. Why do not Mr. Taft and Mr. Roosevelt announce their platforms? And the same question might be put to some democratic candidates. The people are entitled to know for what their candidates stand and what can be expected of them.

Practical Tariff Talks

If there is any man in the United States who still retains the delusion that the real and primary object and accomplishment of the protective tariff are to insure to labor a living wage, let him read the facts brought out about conditions at Lawrence, Mass., the center of the worsted cloth-making industry of this country. If there is any one part of the tariff law that a clear majority of intelligent men are agreed upon as exorbitant, extortionate and excessive, it is that known as Schedule K, the woolen schedule. Even President Taft says so, and that ought to be convincing. If, therefore, the workers under Schedule K do not receive a living wage then it would seem hopeless to attempt to insure this by law. The evidence submitted differs somewhat as to what are the average wages paid adults at the Lawrence mills, but the correct sum is probably not much in excess of \$7 a week. Think of that as a sum upon which to support and rear a family.

The last census figures at hand show that in 1905 the value of the woolen manufactures of the United States was \$767,000,000. If all of these goods had been purchased abroad they would have cost \$405,000,000. This leaves a margin of protection for the manufacturers of \$362,000,000. The census bureau says that the labor cost of producing these goods was \$135,000,000. The difference between that

sum and the \$362,000,000 of protection—and more, because no account is taken in this calculation of the labor cost abroad—represented what was put in the pocket of the manufacturer. Under the protective theory as explained in the last republican national platform the manufacturer was charged with the duty of taking this protection, extracting therefrom his reasonable profit and handing the remainder over to labor. With wages averaging \$7 or \$8 a week for adults in his mills, how much of this money do you think Mr. William Wood and his associates retained as a reasonable profit and how much did they give their workmen?

The answer is not far to find: The mills built at Lawrence by Mr. Wood paid for themselves the first five years they were built. They consume over 24,000,000 pounds of scoured wool in a year, and they, with other worsted mills, have been given a special privilege or advantage over all mills which produce the cheaper grades of clothing. Five worsted mills at Lawrence consume eighty million pounds of wool (scoured weight) a year, which is about two-thirds of all the wool grown in the United States. The development of this industry has been one of the wonders of industrialism, but there is no secret about it when one examines the way the tariff was juggled in favor of this industry.

The worsted industry uses almost exclusively the combing or long fibred wools. The woolen mills, where the carding process is employed, uses only the shorter wools. The longer wools shrink very much less than the heavier and shorter wools, but the tariff levies the same duty per pound upon them both. Here is what President Taft's tariff board says of this matter: "As one result of this various wools of heavy shrinkage can not be profitably imported into the United States. Another result is the practice abroad of preparing and selecting light-shrinking sorts that are peculiarly suitable for the American trade. Certain manufacturers complain of the first result, on the ground that it prevents them from using the heavier conditioned wools of foreign origin. Domestic wool growers, on the other hand, complain of the second result on the ground that it enables manufacturers to procure clean wool of the light-shrinking sorts at a materially lower net rate of duty than the law apparently contemplated. The board finds that both of these complaints are well-founded and that steps should be taken to remove the cause."

Briefly stated, here is what we find: That the worsted industry, enjoying the highest protection afforded by the law for forty-five years, enjoying a special advantage over competitive wool industries that must use heavier shrinking wools; marked by a development extraordinary in its character; earning dividends that gave its stock high quotations on the market, has been paying such small wages that it has practically driven American born workmen out of the mills and filled them with Italians, Lithuanians, Poles, French Canadians, Armenians, Franco-Belgians and the like; that these, when their wages were reduced because the state law cut the hours of labor from fifty-six to fifty-four hours a week for women and children, refused longer to work.

Isn't it clear to even the most sodden intellect that the manufacturers have been keeping for themselves the money they were empowered by the tariff law to collect and hand over to labor? C. Q. D.

NOT FOR HARMON

A Columbus, Ohio, dispatch says: At the meeting of the democratic state central committee recently, Mayor Baker of Cleveland, was elected to the place on the committee made vacant by the death of Tom L. Johnson. Before he was elected Baker took the floor and declared his anti-Harmon principles. "I do not want to get on this committee on false pretenses," he said. "Governor Harmon is not my ideal as a candidate for president. If I go on the committee I want to reserve for myself the greatest freedom of action to help the democratic party select some man more progressive and more in tune with the progressive spirit of the times. I do not question Harmon's greatness as a lawyer or as a man, but I do think the democratic party should select some one more progressive."

"Woe to him that buildeth a town with blood, and establisheth a city by iniquity."